

THE Converted Catholic.

EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.—Luke xxii., 32.

Vol. V.

NEW YORK, JUNE, 1888.

No. 6.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Specially designed for the enlightenment of Roman Catholics and their conversion to Evangelical Christianity.

JAMES A. O'CONNOR, PUBLISHER.
60 Bible House, New York.

Subscription, Per Year, - - - - \$1.00
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

Subscribers can have sample copies sent to friends by forwarding name and address.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as second-class mail matter.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

CHRISTIANITY DEMANDS THE CONVERSION of the Catholics in the United States. Romanism is not Christianity. St. Paul says in his Epistle to the Romans, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon Him: for, Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

"No, no," says the Pope, "you cannot be saved except you believe in me. Let Paul talk as he pleases about Jesus, there is no salvation out of my Church."

PATRIOTISM DEMANDS THE CONVERSION of Roman Catholics. Father Isaac T. Hecker, of New York, the founder of the Congregation of St. Paul, and head of the Paulist Fathers in this city, said in the April, 1870, issue of the *Catholic World*, an able Roman Catholic monthly, of which he is editor:

CONTENTS

	PAGE.
Converted Catholics Steadfast.....	162
Former Priests now Lawyers.....	162
Converted by Reading "THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC".....	163
Romanism and Politics.....	164
Papal Flag in Politics.....	164
A Great Victory for St. Joseph.....	165
The Catholic University.....	168
Our Living Redeemer.....	169
Convent Schools.....	170
Converts from Rome.....	171
Father Huiginn's Conversion.....	173
The Pope and Politics.....	175
The Papacy.....	176
Cardinal Newman and the Virgin Mary.....	179
Typical Catholic Saints.....	180
Father McGlynn's Old Parishioners.....	184
The Church of Rome not the Church of Christ.....	185
Irish Catholic Slaves.....	188
Are Roman Catholics Illiterate.....	189
Father O'Connor's Letters to Cardinal Gibbons.....	191

"Our only protection under God is the fact that we have votes that the leaders of all parties want." A glance at the political horizon just now confirms his statement, though he might have added, We are for sale to the highest bidder.

Truly Converted Catholics Steadfast.

CAN Roman Catholics be really converted? This has been the question of questions in large cities where many missions for all kinds of people are established. Catholics attend those missions, as do Pagans, Jews and Gentiles. But are the Catholics less amenable to the religious influence of the missions than the Jews or Pagans?

We believe many Catholics are converted at the missions in all the large cities, and such converts are to be found among the most efficient missionary workers everywhere. We have a large list of such, and if we do not publish their experiences, it is because we have so much excellent material from converts who had precedence that we can hardly find room for the best and clearest testimony. Since we commenced this Reformed Catholic work we have published in the columns of the *New York Witness* two hundred testimonies from converts from Rome, which have been widely copied, and for the last five years we have published in the pages of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* the testimonies of 800 converts, that have been sent to us from all parts of the United States, or were handed to us by those who have been converted at our Reformed Catholic Services in Masonic Temple, New York. These testimonies are very encouraging, and have been a blessing to many souls.

Former Priests now Lawyers.

AT the meeting in the Academy of Music, New York, April 8, 1888. Father McGlynn characterized Bishop Gilmour as "A Scotch Presbyterian masquerading as the Roman Catholic Bishop of Cleveland." The audience laughed at this, but they should know that there is not much of the Presbyterian left in him after his many years in the priesthood. Jesuitism has driven it out. Bishop Becker, late of Wilmington, Del., now of Savannah, Ga., is the only other bishop in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States whose parents were Presbyterians. Rev. J. B. Williams, pastor of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, White Lake, N. Y., was a class-mate of Becker's in a college in Pennsylvania when both were preparing for the ministry. After Becker became a Roman Catholic he induced his brother to change his creed also and become a priest, but the young man soon got sick of the false pretences, hollow mockeries and deceptions that he saw around him, and especially in the private lives of the priests, and he renounced the whole system. He is now practicing law, like Father Gerdeman in Philadelphia, and like him, too, is raising an honorable family.

Another ex-priest who is a lawyer in Philadelphia, is Father Butler who was pastor of a Roman Catholic church in Jersey City. He also is a married man, his wife being the daughter of a wealthy undertaker named Brady in Jersey City. Father Goodwin, who was pastor of a Roman Catholic church in Brooklyn, and who caused an earthquake in the City of Churches by marrying a nun, the superioress of his convent, is also prosperous in business in Philadelphia.

Converted by Reading "The
Converted Catholic."

THE pleasure afforded us by the following letter has been such that we want to share it with our readers. It is very encouraging to see fruit from our labors while yet in the thick of the fight and undergoing the heat and burden of the day. To God be all the glory!

NEW YORK, May 7, 1888.

REV. J. A. O'CONNOR.

DEAR SIR:—I was born, about thirty years ago, within ten miles of Castle Island, County Kerry, Ireland. You know what a benighted region that is, and can judge what facilities I possessed for acquiring sound learning of any kind. Well, I have rejected Popery and have to thank you largely for opening my eyes to its abominations. I am married and have a wife and two children, and a good salary; I have been with my present employers five years. I permitted my children to be baptized in the Roman Catholic Church, but did not go with them to the church as I objected to ever again enter such temples of idolatry. I have told my wife freely what I think of the Romish Church, but she is totally invincible, if I may use the word. I now wish to join some Christian Church. Can you introduce me?

I wish this to be kept secret at present. Please do not publish my name in THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, though you may put my initials if you wish.

Hoping to hear from you, I am,

Yours sincerely, R. O.

We replied as follows:

60 BIBLE HOUSE,

NEW YORK, May 8, 1888

DEAR SIR:—In reply to your favor

I would like to see you if you could call at my office to-morrow evening before eight o'clock. I have another engagement that keeps me in the office late, and I can see you at the same time. Very truly yours,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

The gentleman called, a fine-looking aggressive Irishman. He told us his experience. We cannot give it here, at least not now, but our readers may expect to hear from him in good time. He told us he first heard of the work we are doing by seeing a copy of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC in the reading room of the Young Men's Christian Association, Fourth avenue and Twenty-third street, New York. He read it, as well as other copies, with the result that he was converted.

We wish to place the magazine in every public library, reading room and Young Men's Christian Association in the country because we know such places are frequented by the best class of Roman Catholic young men. Last month in the report of the Reformed Catholic Services in Masonic Temple, reference was made to the case of a young man named O'Connell who was converted by reading THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC in the Boston Public Library. In a letter dated March 5, 1888, he said: "If I move to New York I will do my best as a worker in the cause in which you are engaged, and try to bring other Catholics to worship Jesus as the only Saviour, and not the Virgin Mary or the Pope. The Good Book says: Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. No Pope in that, thank God. As a son of the Emerald Isle—that beautiful Isle that has been cursed by Popish rule and Popish superstitions—I wish you Godspeed in your work. "PATRICK O'CONNELL."

Romanism and Politics.

California seems to be in a bad way politically. Both the Republican and Democratic parties are ruled by Irish Roman Catholics. Americans who will not truckle to the Roman Catholic vote are forced to the rear. The editor of the San Francisco *Argonaut*, who has been for years waging war on the "Pope's Irish," as he calls the Roman Catholics, tells his experience in the issue of his paper for April 4, 1888. He says :

We have been driven from the Republican party by Irish bosses, and an Irish mob has invaded our precinct, taken possession of our club, driven our neighbors out of their own hall, and sent delegates to State and County conventions, where, if an opportunity is presented to decide against an American, and in favor of a Roman Catholic Irishman who belongs body and soul to the Pope, the Irishman gets the favor, and the American is snubbed.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC does not concern itself with politics except when it sees the Pope's finger in the pie, but a wide observation enables it to say that the political condition of California is paralleled in every State of the Union where the Roman Catholic vote is strong. That vote is a unit against every candidate for office who does not "blarney" the Irish and respectfully acknowledge the power of the Pope. This was our experience in the priesthood, and we could have told the California editor what would be his fate politically for ridiculing the "Pope's Irish."

The admirable pamphlet, "Romanism and Politics; Tammany Hall the Stronghold of Rome," by Rev. Joseph Hartwell, an honored Methodist minister of Binghamton, N. Y., shows how New York as well as California is ruled by the "Pope's Irish."

The Papal Flag in American Politics.

Among the decorations at the Academy of Music, New York, at the New York State Convention, May 15, were the key, shield and crown, the insignia of Papal authority, "and the harp of Erin as well," remarks the New York *Herald* of May 16. The same paper said that at the lunch provided for the delegates in Tammany Hall, which adjoins the Academy of Music, 1,400 bottles of champagne were consumed. The New York *World*, of the same date, said, "Bowl after bowl of punch was emptied and the tables were cleared and replenished and cleared again, while the wine flowed like water, and the popping of corks kept up a lively fusillade. Over 1,400 bottles of champagne were opened during the afternoon."

At the meeting of the Democratic National Committee on the same day, it was resolved to make Congressman Patrick A. Collins, of Boston, chairman of the Democratic National Convention to be held in St. Louis, June 5, for the renomination of President Cleveland. As Mr. Collins is a devoted Roman Catholic, he will, of course, select a Roman Catholic priest to open the Convention with prayer.

Recruits for the Papal flag and Tammany Hall are landing at Castle Garden by the thousand every day. A dispatch said 5,000 Irish emigrants sailed from Queenstown April 5 for America. They are all Roman Catholics. If the men settle in New York, Tammany Hall will have them ready to vote at the next Presidential election. Those thousands should be converted, or they will prove the ruin of the Republic.

A GREAT VICTORY FOR SAINT JOSEPH.

REV. G. W. CHAMBERLAIN has been engaged for twenty-five years in missionary work among the Roman Catholics of Sao Paulo, Brazil. He is one of the oldest and best beloved missionaries of the New York Board of Foreign Missions.

The letter about St. Joseph's great victory was handed to us by the gentleman who received it from Dr. Chamberlain, with the remark that it was one of the best things he ever read. Each of our readers will say the same. We are very glad to add that instead of one hundred dollars, the gentleman sent Dr. Chamberlain two hundred dollars for his mission in Brazil. The following is Dr. Chamberlain's letter to us:

PRESBYTERIAN CENTENNIAL
GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

PHILADELPHIA, May 21, 1888.

DEAR BROTHER O'CONNOR:—More than two years since I received a letter from my lamented friend, (who never refused to "lend a hand," in His name, for every good work,) Dr. Cornelius Rea Agnew, then of your city, now of "the City that hath foundations," in which he said: "I told to a gentleman the story you told me how St. Joseph got a sinner into Heaven through influence with the Virgin against the will of the Father. He said he would give one hundred dollars for that in writing." This was the origin of the letter which afterwards came into your hands and which you desire to publish. I am glad that it is to see the light, in your excellent magazine—THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, which I wish might be in the hand of every Protestant in our land as well as

in that of every deluded Romanist; for I find deluded ones among my own people, not ignorant or ill-informed men, but trusted watchmen on Zion's walls, who do not see the enemy for the dust he raises and are not therefore sounding the trumpet, though the sword is surely coming, and many are perishing and will perish for lack of warning. It must amaze you, my dear Brother, that the question: "Is Rome a foe or an ally in the evangelization of our own and other lands?" could be debated in an assembly of Presbyterians. So "full of subtlety" is Rome, that she is for the time deceiving the very "elect." You, "to the manner born," and I for a quarter of a century dwelling at one of the seats of the "Beast," have had our eyes opened, and must not cease to open the eyes of the blind on this question. May God who leadeth even the blind by a way they know not, make THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC and its beloved editor a blessing to many.

GEORGE W. CHAMBERLAIN.

REV. G. W. CHAMBERLAIN'S LETTER
FROM SAO PAULO, BRAZIL.

You ask me for my recollections of the sermon in which the congregation were told that "St. Joseph got a sinner into Heaven through his influence with the Virgin Mary etc., and against the will of the Father."

In the year 1870 said sermon was published in the *Correio Paulistano*, then our largest daily, as having been preached by a notable priest of his day in Naples, to the Lazzaroni of that city.

In a letter written at the time (a copy of which I have), I said: One of the most blasphemous pieces of ephemeral liter-

ature that I have ever read, appeared in the *Correio Paulistano*. I called upon the editor of our most popular daily, to protest against the insertion in his columns of such offensive matter. "You forget the majesty of God so far as to make him figure as a puppet and a tool of the Saints, for San Jose is made to carry the day against God in behalf of one of his devotees, an Italian brigand, and blasphemously defy God's law."

"It is the logical result of the Church's teaching," was the reply, "and we are not responsible for the blasphemy."

I confess I was not then prepared to make the Roman Catholic Church responsible for the bald blasphemy of one of her priests, but the Bishop of Rio de Janeiro, and the professor of Theology at the Diocesan Seminary of Sao Paulo, shortly after convinced me that the editor was right. The image of the beast which had on its "heads names of blasphemy" (Rev. xiii, 1.) and "of a woman sitting on a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy" (Rev. xvii: 3.), was reflected in the sermon, of which I can recall in substance the following:

"Do you know how powerful an advocate St. Joseph is?" said the priest to his audience. "You remember a noted brigand who was executed for his crimes? Well, he presented himself before St. Peter, who holds the keys of Heaven, who bade him begone to his own place. He went down to hell, but was told at the entrance that no "devotee" of St. Joseph ever was admitted there. Up again he toiled, but was met with a stern refusal on the part of St. Peter who refused to recognize the plea that he had devout-

ly prayed to St. Joseph. The latter Saint, hearing his name mentioned, drew near and listened to the colloquy which was going on at the door of which St. Peter held the keys. He advocated the cause of his client until the contention grew so hot that appeal was taken to the Highest. St. Peter's decision was maintained by the Almighty. St. Joseph indignantly prepared to leave the celestial court. He called upon his wife—the Virgin Mary—to accompany him. She obeyed like a dutiful spouse. But she was told to use her authority with her Son, as the Mother of God, to see that he too went with them. He was subject to his parents. But St. Joseph became more exigent. "We are not going alone," said he, "let him command the saints to follow." All prepared to obey these behests, when the Eternal Father, finding that he was about to be left alone with St. Peter, reversed the order, and the devotee of St. Joseph was admitted to the celestial court, and peace and order were restored in heaven." This from the sermon of the Italian Priest in Naples.

As I said, I was loath to believe that any such utterances would be tolerated in any pulpit of the Roman Catholic Church, and was disposed to attribute the sermon to some caricaturist who wished to draw out in a bald way some of the conclusions from premises in which Romish theology is fruitful. But the Bishop of Rio de Janeiro returning in the following year (1871,) from the Vatican Council, made haste to convoke the priests of his diocese in the Seminary of St. Joseph, and there felicitated his auditors on the fact that by the decree of that council, St. Joseph had been made universal patron of the church. For the same reasons, 'said

the bishop, we conclude that St. Joseph has great power in the presence of God.

We may resume in two words: Having real rights as legitimate spouse over the Queen of Heaven who is the channel of heavenly graces and favors, St. Joseph is an omnipotent protector.

In the second place, having real rights as the putative father of Jesus Christ,—the Son of Mary, his wife, and of God the Father,—St. Joseph is not only an omnipotent protector, but holds omnipotence himself at his orders.

Shudder not, oh reader, as though I had reproduced some horrible caricature of an enemy of the faith. No, these are the words of the Christian (?) Bishop of the Diocese of Rio de Janeiro, fresh from sessions of the Vatican Council, proffered to an illustrious assembly of priests and theological students congregated in the Seminario Episcopal de San Jose, in the heart of the largest city of South America. We have not raked the dust of the middle ages for relics of what Rome was, but quote from the official organ of the Bishopric, *O Apostolo*, an authorized report of His Excellency's sermon. Hear him a little further:

"Therefore the Church took a well advised step when in these evil times, and by request of the faithful, she proclaimed St. Joseph Universal Patron of the Catholic Church."

What can the Church fear, having by the throne of God such a protector? Let the tempest of persecution be unchained! Let the thunders of error rattle! Let the lightnings of blasphemy flash! Let the sea of impiety roar furiously and roll its revolutionary waves against the Throne of St. Peter! Let the muddy and poisoned waters of Italian hypocrisy undermine Rome!

"At one nod of St. Joseph, the Omnipotent lifts his arm, the tempest is dissipated, the Sun of truth and justice reappears before the eyes of trembling humanity, and evil is hurled into the depths of the abysm." Thus far the Bishop, Dom Pedro de Lacerda, who still governs the important Diocese of Rio de Janeiro.

Now hear the Professor of Theology, the French Priest at that time in charge of the youth preparing for "orders" in the Diocese of this Imperial City of Sao Paulo.

He is at the bedside of a dying Senator of the Empire to give "ghostly counsel" to his immortal soul about to appear in the presence of his Maker. If ever a man should speak the truth from his heart, it is now. If ever the core of one's theology is patent, it should be in such circumstances. Listen then!

"*Senhor Barao, pega-se com San Jose.*" Sir Baron! lay hold of St. Joseph.

"What more?" do you ask, as I did of the eldest daughter of the old Baron of Antonina, when she was narrating to me the interview between the dying Senator of the State, and this authorized representative of the Religion of the State. "What more?" "Nothing more," she said sadly, "he only repeated it, 'take hold of St. Joseph.'" And your father, I could not refrain from saying, your father what did he say? "He said: 'Much obliged, my friend,' and turned his face to the wall." Ah! I replied, I think he had obtained a better hold, a hold on something far better, for he said to me at our last conversation, when for two hours I explained to him the gospel, "I wish my faith reduced to this; the Father, the Son, and

the Holy Ghost."

The aged man, who thus passed away, had lived 92 years in the bosom of the "Holy Mother Church," and as he told me, a few weeks before his death, he had never owned a Bible. This "Holy Mother" is careful to keep from her children the pure milk of the word, lest they grow thereby, and as for the meat, they cannot bear it, for they are not able. Even down to old age and the borders of the tomb, she gives them for the bread of life, a stone—instead of Jesus, Joseph.

Do not blame the Italian Priest, the French Theological Professor, nor the Brazilian Bishop; they gave the best they had, the best the mother church gives them. Oh! ye who have freely received better things, freely give.

G. W. CHAMBERLAIN.

The Catholic University.

JOSIAH W. LEEDS contributes to the Philadelphia *Friend* an article on "Roman Catholicism in the United States," in which he says:

It is not without seemingly good reason that the activity manifested by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, within a few years, in strengthening its position and enlarging its power at the capital of this nation, has been viewed by many Protestants with alarm. The editor of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC states, that more Senators and Representatives send their sons to the Georgetown, (D. C.) College, a Jesuit institution, than to all the other institutions of learning in Washington, and that another Romanist institution at the same place, well patronized by leading men of the nation, is the Academy of Visitation,

"conducted by nuns whose father confessors are the Jesuit priests of the college."

* * *

The corner stone of the new Catholic University at Washington, D. C., was laid May 24, by Cardinal Gibbons. The ceremony was more imposing than a Presidential inauguration. This is presidential year, when the Roman Catholic vote will be in great demand by the politicians of all parties. Therefore Cardinal Gibbons was surrounded by members of the government, Senators and Representatives. Gen. W. S. Rosecrans, Register of the Treasury, a Roman Catholic, of course, was chief marshal. When the University is ready for work it will be filled with the children of public men, and Rome's ascendancy in the Republic will not be far off. The Jesuits are not waiting for the University to be in full operation to prosecute their work. They are unceasingly active. The Roman Catholic *Freeman's Journal* of New York, in its issue of May 19, says: "Dr. Cummings Garland a son of United States Attorney-General Garland, was received into the Catholic fold last month at Saint Aloysius' Church, Washington, D. C., of which the Jesuit Fathers are pastors."

Respecting the aims of this University, Bishop Ireland of St. Paul, remarks: "The faculty will be from within the Church, and the influences thrown around those who enter this school will be distinctly Catholic. I am frank to say, the purpose of the University is to build up and strengthen the Church in this country, and the Church will remain prominent in all the work of the great school."

OUR LIVING REDEEMER.

BY

BY REV. J. P. CARTER, D. D.

BALTIMORE.

"I know that my Redeemer liveth."

Job. 19:21.

READERS of the Bible are familiar with the name of the Patriarch Job. He is usually distinguished as "the most patient man" of whom we read in the Holy Scriptures, and he is so distinguished because in the experience of his great and sore trials, his losses, bereavements and other afflictions, "he sinned not nor charged God foolishly." And his patience becomes the more conspicuous when, in the intercourse with the friends that came to comfort him and condole with him, we discover the ground and reason of his remarkable conduct, that notwithstanding their false and unkind insinuations he felt he was no hypocrite; he was conscious of his integrity with his Father in heaven; that although he did not deny he was, as all other men, a sinner, actually and by nature, yet he knew that his Redeemer was even then living, one who in due time would appear for his complete vindication and eternal salvation.

The "Redeemer," Goel among the Hebrews, was a man's "next friend" and always a blood relation. The rich uncle; the strong cousin; the loving devoted elder brother; such as Abraham to Lot; Moses to the people in bondage; Joshua in leading them into the land of promise; the Judges in delivering them from their oppressors; Boaz to Ruth and David to his people.

The Goel redeemed the mortgaged in-

heritance, rescued from bondage, answered accusations, administered consolation and avenged the slain. Job here declares his confident assurance in the possession of such a friend, "a friend in need," that sticketh closer than a brother, one whom he names his "Living Redeemer."

Now, who was the person thus designated? To whom did Job refer, when in the depth and darkness of his affliction, he cried out in exultation and triumph, "I know that my Redeemer liveth!" He certainly did not refer to the Virgin Mary, to Peter or Paul, or any other patron saint of the present time, for none of these were born until centuries after the days of Job. Nor did he refer to any of the saints of his own time; for his friend, Eliphaz, had expressed the common sentiment of the time, when he spoke in a kind of derision of saint worship, (Job. 5:1.) and declared in effect that the saints as mediators have no influence with the Almighty. (Job. 15:15.) But Job, in the language of the text, could not have referred to any "Saint," even the most holy and honored, either of ancient or modern times. For the "Saints" as they are called *are all dead men and women*; and even if they were living, still they would not be *redeemers*. Paul expressly tells us he was not crucified for sinners. (1 Cor. 1:13.) And this is equally true of the Virgin mother and all the "Saints." Then, if none of them died to redeem the condemned, they have no sacrificial blood to plead at the Mercy Seat as intercessors for the condemned. And thus, having no standing in the Court of Heaven as mediators for perishing men, all that run to them for help and succor, must in the end be woefully

disappointed, and their impotent cry, "*ora pro nobis*," die out unanswered on the desert air.

But the Redeemer of Job was in due time to become the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world," God's dear Son who died upon the Cross, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have eternal life." (John 1:29; 3:16.) And dying "for our sins according to the Scriptures, he was buried; and arising from the dead on the third day he ascended into heaven and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, where he ever liveth to make intercession for us"—"The Only Mediator between God and man." (1. Cor. 15; 3. 4; Heb. 8:1. 21 1 Tim. 2:5.) To this living Redeemer Job had immediate and direct personal access, without the intervening patronage of the saints; in the ability of that Redeemer alone to save him to the uttermost (Heb. 7:25.) he had unwavering confidence, and he went to the grave in the assurance that in the final resurrection he would, in the personal, joyous companionship of his living Redeemer, he made perfectly blessed in the full enjoyment of God to all eternity.

And we, too, may by faith enjoy the same blessed interest in Job's "Living Redeemer," the God-man Christ Jesus; and hence in our losses, we may find reparation; and in our bereavement, consolation. When misunderstood, misrepresented or wronged by friend or foe, we shall be vindicated. In our temptations and danger we shall be rescued. When our own awakened conscience truly and faithfully charges home upon us our follies, failures or crimes, our all-prevailing Mediator and Advocate will answer every charge and as-

sure our pardon on the merit alone of his own peace-speaking blood, while the leadings of his own Providence may conduct us to the kingdom, through much tribulation; not imposed however, as a paltry, worthless "penance," but in parental discipline, that we may be made partakers of his holiness.

And when we come to die, realizing that we must speedily appear before the judgment seat, we shall feel no need of "the last sacraments," and shall not be disturbed by the prospect of "purgatorial fire," but we may with peace, composure and triumph exclaim with the Patriarch "I know that my Redeemer liveth!" For the souls of believers are at death made perfect in holiness and do immediately pass into glory; and their bodies being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves until the resurrection.

Convent Schools.

The *Montreal Witness* says: "Those Protestants who send their impressionable daughters to a nunnery for their education, trusting their early principles—usually in such cases nil—and the promises of the nuns not to interfere with their religion, are to be commiserated when their bright girls are led as victims to grace a roman triumph, in the accounts of which every insult is heaped on their own faith. Do they not know that the education in question is given cheap by professed promoters of the Roman faith for the very purpose of capturing those Protestant girls?"

The initial gift for the Catholic University at Washington,—three hundred thousand dollars, was contributed by the daughter of a Protestant who had received her education in a Convent.

 CONVERTS ÷ FROM ÷ ROME.

 MONSIGNOR BOULAND SAYS GOODBY TO THE POPE.

NEW YORK, April 12, 1888.

MOST HOLY FATHER :—I have the honor to inform your holiness that, from to-day, (my canonical standing being perfectly regular and unquestioned) I deliberately though sorrowfully separate myself from the Roman Church, for the following reasons :

1. *Doctrinally*, it is no longer possible for me to believe the teaching of the Syllabus, and the dogmas proclaimed at the last Vatican Council.

2. *Politically*, I can no longer admit the pretensions of Ultramontanism, claiming, as it does, absolute authority, not only in matters religious, but also in matters scientific, philosophic, social and political. Such pretensions history proves to be destructive of religion and public liberty. The Roman hierarchy constitutes in the United States (a country of which I am proud to be a citizen) a danger ever on the increase. This I have repeatedly mentioned to your holiness, in the private audiences with which I have from time to time been honored. In separating from the Church of Rome, as did Saints Cyprian and Augustine, I do not sever myself from the Catholic Church, which they called the *Radix et Matrix* of Rome herself. Happily among the Latin churches there are those, like the Anglican Church, the Church of Utrecht, and that of the old Catholics, in which the Nicene Constitutions are still respected. In this great republic also, I find a Church truly Apostolic and Nicene, wholly independent of the

State, and which understands how to reconcile in due proportion the rights that liberty confers with the duties which it imposes. In that Church—to which I now declare my adherence—faith does not shut out reason or science, which, together with true religion, make intelligent Christians and enlightened citizens.

In my native France, as your holiness well knows, there are Latin Christians who still represent the position of the Gallican Church in 1682 ; and I may see it to be my duty to identify myself with those who have not deserted the ancient Gallican standpoint of St. Louis and Bossuet. In that fair land republican government, which alone can satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people in our day, will never be firmly established, nor will the necessary reforms in the Church be secured, until the clergy burst their ultramontane and monarchical bonds, and unite frankly with the people in abolishing the Concordate, and organizing a Church truly national and Nicene, like that in the United States of America, independent alike of the State and of Rome.

My decision to withdraw from the Roman Church is not a thought of recent origin. It is the mature result of convictions forced upon me during my travels in both hemispheres, and of my study for ten years of the chief religious and social questions which agitate our time—questions to which the Christian fathers furnish solutions wholly at variance with the Syllabus,

and the policy of the Ultramontane Court.

Should your holiness wish me to explain my views more fully, I shall be happy to receive instructions to that effect.

Condescend, most holy Father, to accept anew the assurance of my profound respect.

LEON BOULAND.

Honorary Private Chamberlain of
His Holiness Leo XIII., etc.,
To His Holiness Pope Leo XIII.,
Vatican, Rome.

WHO HE IS.

Monsignor Bouland, as we learn from the *New York Churchman*, April 28, is a Frenchman by birth and education, and is about forty years of age. He graduated with the highest honors from the University of Paris at an early age, and studied for the priesthood under the personal direction of his eminence, Cardinal Lavigerie, Archbishop of Algiers, and Primate of Africa. In 1881, Mgr. Bouland received the honorary appointment of Canon of St. Michael the Archangel, Rome; and in 1882, that of President-General of the Society of the "Avocats de Pierre" in North America. In the same year he was made a member of the "Academie des Arcades" in Rome; Canon of the Metropolitan Church of Rheims; Commander of the Order of the Holy Sepulchre; and Private Chamberlain to Pope Leo XIII. In June, 1886, Mgr. Bouland was appointed by his holiness, General Director of the organization in North America of the Society of St. Peter's Pence. He first visited this country in 1875 for the purpose of writing a history of the French in North America. This work, we understand, is almost ready for the press.

While preparing it he has also occupied himself with the pastoral charge of a French Roman Catholic church at Central Falls, R. I., and with the founding of another French church in Boston. Mgr. Bouland has travelled extensively in both hemispheres; from the Northern part of Canada to Peru on the American continent, and in Europe through all the countries from St. Petersburg to Jerusalem and Constantinople. As will be seen by his letter to the Pope, which we print in another column, his decision to withdraw from the Roman Church is the result of mature deliberation, based upon a wide experience in Roman Catholic countries, and an intimate knowledge of the Roman hierarchy. Mgr. Bouland has applied for permission to officiate as a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

To the various attacks made on him by the various Papal agencies in this country for renouncing Romanism, Monsignor Bouland replies as follows:

17 LAFAYETTE PLACE, NEW YORK.

April 28, 1888.

To the Public.

Since the publication of my letter to the Pope, in which I endeavored to state respectfully my reasons for leaving the Church of Rome, the following charges have been brought against me:

1. That I was compelled to leave Woonsocket, R. I., in disgrace, after having been burned in effigy. This is absolutely false. There was, however, a Belgian priest in charge of the Canadian parish in Woonsocket, who was hanged in effigy, and this may account for, but does not excuse, the gross calumny uttered, according to newspaper report, by Father Lavelle,

of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

2. That I was compelled to leave Central Falls and Boston. This also is absolutely false. Official letters of highly complimentary character, both in regard to my public ministrations and my private conduct, from the Bishop of Providence and the Archbishop of Boston, are now in my possession, and may be seen by any persons who wish to know the truth.

3. That at Greenville, S. C., I was charged with adultery, and that the case did not come to trial. The truth is, that my partner in a vineyard, with whom I had difficulty in obtaining a settlement of our affairs, accused me of cohabiting with my servant, an old widow. This was a clear case of blackmail. He wished to withdraw the charge, but I insisted on a public investigation in court, which took place on April 6, 1887. The *Greenville Daily News* of that date states "the jury was out only nineteen minutes, when the clerk read out, 'not guilty.'" That the sentiment of the people of Greenville in reference to this matter was wholly in my favor, was shown by the fact that a deputation, headed by the Roman Catholic priest, waited upon me with their congratulations, and that the Bishop of Charleston wrote to me as follows:

"RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR SIR: I am very glad to hear of your acquittal of the charge brought against you."

On announcing my secession from the Church of Rome, I expected at least fair and gentlemanly treatment at the hands of her ministers. This, however, has not been accorded me, and I must now appeal to the public, confident that their sense of justice will condemn the mode of warfare to which my

enemies have descended.

As to the validity of my titles, which has been questioned by Archbishop Corrigan and others, I have only to say, that while I do not wish to seem to attach undue importance to secondary matters, I am ready at any time to furnish the most positive proof of what has been claimed by me. I am, &c.,

LEON BOULAND.

Father Eugene V. Huiginn's
Conversion.

ON THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC for July 1887, we had a long notice of the reception of Father E. V. Huiginn, the priest of St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, Watertown, N. Y., into the Protestant Episcopal Church, by Bishop Huntington of Syracuse. Father Huiginn had been educated in Maynooth College, Ireland, where all the Irish Priests are trained for their work, but as he was not in sympathy with the Land League or boycotting, he was glad to seek refuge from persecution in the United States. Five years ago he was appointed by Bishop Wadhams, (who was once a Protestant Episcopal clergyman), to the assistant pastorate of St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, Watertown, N. Y., where he officiated until he applied to Bishop Huntington of Syracuse, to be received into the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Since his reception into the Episcopal Church, Father Huiginn has been engaged in literary work. Last October he wrote a learned article on "Excommunication" for the *Forum* magazine, in which Dr. McGlynn's case was discussed. Another article from his pen appeared in the *Forum* of last April in which he treats of his own

conversion to Protestantism. From that article we make the following extract:

"During my first year's divinity course at Maynooth, the treatises on true religion, both natural and supernatural, were read. The entire current of theological thought was turned to prove the Papal authority and infallibility. Here it was that my mind first rebelled. The arguments used to build up the claims of the Pope seemed to be unworthy and untenable. The doctrines of Papal infallibility appeared to me to be unnecessary and injurious, making Catholicity, as taught by Rome, repulsive to men's minds, who could not help thinking that the world had lived for centuries before without such a doctrine, and that God could save them in the future as in the past without the necessity of an assent to such a claim. The history of the Church had made me skeptical of the virtue, truth and honesty of the Popes; and I had learned enough at the time to know that a passive, negative state of mind is not positive faith. Certainly, past ages had not positive faith in the Vatican doctrines; why exact such of future ones? About this time in my life I was made to feel that the Pope was more to me than Christ; that, if I believed not all the Popes said about themselves, no matter how strong my faith in Christ, I could not be saved. Christ might have redeemed me, but the Pope was to save me.

The Protestant and Greek Churches I had been taught to believe heretical and schismatical. They (especially the Protestant Church) were the wolves in sheep's clothing, the robbers who had entered at the window, the false prophets and teachers who were doing wonders in Christ's name. I could not think of joining either. All my edu-

cation and prejudices were against such a course; and the social ostracism that was sure to follow, and the severance of the ties that bound me to all I loved, were a little more than I would have dared to face at that time of life.

I thought, too, that if indulgences are of such value, they should be made more general and easier to gain. The Roman Church says that nothing pleases God more than to pray for the souls in purgatory and gain indulgences for them, so that He may receive them the sooner into the enjoyment of the beatific vision. Why not help the suffering souls by granting them the most ample indulgences? Why make these graces to the dead depend upon the indolent and often irreligious living? Why not grant every priest the grace of a privileged altar every day in the year, so that he can gain pardon for the suffering souls? Why not make the conditions for gaining these indulgences easier? Is Rome afraid of bankrupting the treasury of the Church by overdrawing the infinite merits of Christ? Or does she think that God enjoys the pains of the suffering in purgatory, or does Rome herself cruelly enjoy the torments of the tortured saints? If they are so beneficial to the living, why not make these favors more general, more easy to obtain? My confessor either could not, or would not, believe that my faith was ebbing away very fast. In Maynooth, hard-working students are considered to be safe men. Perhaps my confessor judged me by this rule, and looked upon my doubts as being not deliberate enough to amount to heresy in the Roman sense.

I was ordained a priest. For some time before my ordination I had by reading, and meditating and listening

to lectures, worked myself up to a high state of religious feeling, and casting all thoughts of philosophy and theology and history to the winds, I determined to have peace, and for a time I had. But it was not for long. I remained in college after I was ordained, and continued my studies. The old doubts and troubles returned. At last I could no longer doubt as to my position with regard to the Roman Church—I did not believe in it. A confessor myself, I felt that, depending on acting by the principles of Roman casuistry, it would be utterly impossible for me to direct such a mind as I knew my own to be. I determined to leave the Church of Rome. No sooner had I taken the first steps than my fears magnified and courage forsook me; I took counsel with some friends and deferred to their wishes. They had hopes that time would work a change in me and confirm me in the Roman faith. For more than a year I waited, but no change came, and then I parted from the Church I had loved and served all my life, whose doctrines I wished to accept, but could not, nor have I regretted the step."

—•••— The Pope and Politics.

THE New York Times, April 26, 1888, has an editorial on "The Pope and Politics," in which it says:

Monsignor Bouland resigns his priestly office upon the ground that "the Roman hierarchy constitutes in the United States a danger ever on the increase." Ultramontanism, he says, "claims absolute authority not only in matters religious, but also in matters scientific, philosophic, social, and political." He adds that "such pretensions history

proves to be destructive of religion and public liberty." It is at least evident that if they are acquiesced in by any considerable body of American citizens they constitute a danger to the country, and that nobody who acquiesces in them can be a good American citizen. The question is one of fact whether the Roman Catholic Church in this country does make such pretensions. Mgr. BOULAND, who is a competent and disinterested witness, declares that it does. Nor is there wanting other evidence in the same direction.

A priest in this city [Monsignor Preston] some time since told his congregation that whoever said he would take his religion from the Pope, but not his politics, was not a good Catholic. He subsequently explained that he meant that a man who would impute to the Pope a disposition to dictate upon secular questions was not a good Catholic. A good Catholic must not only accept the decision of the Pope as final and absolute upon questions of faith and morals, but he must also accept his decision as to what are matters of faith and morals. This really amounts, as Mgr. BOULAND declares, to a claim of absolute authority in matters scientific, philosophic, social, and political, as well as religious. If it be admitted, then the Pope may at any time direct the faithful to disregard the laws of the land and compel them to choose between being bad citizens and bad Catholics. If there be any considerable number of American Catholics, priests or laymen, who would in such a case "take their politics from the Pope" it is true, as Mgr. BOULAND says, that "the Roman hierarchy constitutes in the United States a danger ever on the increase."

THE PAPACY.

Its Present Position, Policy and Prospects.

BY REV. J. A. WYLIE, LL. D., AUTHOR OF THE "HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM". ETC.

I.

THESE five centuries past, the outer and inner Papacies have been running two entirely different and opposite courses. Looked at on its political side, the Papacy is seen to be undergoing a process of decay: its political props have been mouldering into dust. Looked at on its religious side, it is seen, century by century, waxing in statue, and consolidating in power.

The Papacy these centuries past has been perfecting the chain of its dogmas, laying deeper and broader the foundations of its authority, and riveting its hold upon the human conscience; in short, its career has been not unlike that of man himself, when his body decays by lapse, while yet his mind grows in moral and intellectual strength. The body of the Papacy has been returning to the dust out of which it was taken: but its soul, loosened from the earthly burdens that weighed it down, has been shooting higher and higher into the heavens; as if to persuade men that it is instinct with an immortal life, and endowed with a god-like strength.

The Papacy attained its political noon in the days of Innocent III., in the thirteenth century. It continued to flourish in power unimpaired, and splendor undimmed, for a century longer. In the days of John Wycliffe—whose colossal figure stands at the parting of the ages, marking the point where the modern times begin to dawn

—the first great blow was dealt to the political power of Rome. Then it was that the famous schism fell out. There was not one—but three—Popes, each claiming to be the true successor of Peter, and the real Vicegerent of God; and each anathematising the other as an undoubted imposter and a veritable Lucifer. This flagrant scandal entailed great loss of prestige on the Papacy, which it never after fully recovered. The princes of Europe were now better able to make their own terms with the Tiara; and this contributed to the emancipation of the temporal from the spiritual power.

The next stroke that befel the Papacy was the Pragmatic Sanction, in France, an arrangement betwixt the government and the Pope, which guaranteed the French Church in a considerable amount of independence of the Papal See, and to the same extent abridged the Pope's power in that influential kingdom. It was in fact the beginning of the Gallican liberties.

There followed the Statutes of Provisors, of Premunire, and of Mortmain by which death-bed bequests and numerous other extortions were greatly curtailed, if not abolished, in England. These enactments inflicted great financial, as well as great political damage on the Papacy; inasmuch as in few countries of Europe had the Pope been able to reap, from year to year, so rich a revenue, or to exercise so large a measure of power, as in England.

There came next

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

The numerous and sore disasters which the Reformation brought with it to the Papacy I need not dwell upon. One-half the kingdoms of Europe revolted from under the sceptre. It was laboring to repair these immense losses, and had already recovered Bavaria, Bohemia, Hungary and Belgium, when suddenly its sky was overcast by the darkness of the French Revolution. On the wings of that tempest came new and strange calamities to the Church of Rome. Her priests were massacred; her revenues confiscated; her dignitaries cast down; the very chair of her Popes was for a time suppressed—a cup all the more bitter that papal hands held it to her lips and compelled her to drink it.

The storm passed, and there came a pause; the wonderful recuperative energies of Rome were put forth in effacing the ravages of the tempest, and restoring the Church to something like her former estate. But the calm was treacherous. We have seen in our own days the work of despoiling the Roman Church resumed. One Italian province has been torn from the Papacy after another; and, last of all, we have seen the top-stone put upon the political humiliations of that Church in the loss of Rome, the throne of her temporal dominion, and the chief seat of her spiritual authority. And now what do we behold? A spectacle that may well fill us with amazement and awe—the political Papacy in ruins. But out of its ruins there stands up a vast spiritual colossus; its feet more firmly planted on the earth, and its head lifted higher into the heavens than in any former age!

Let us pause and mark the great and solemn lesson taught in this to the men now living, and to the ages to come. The power of systems for good or evil lies in their hidden springs. It is eminently so with the Papacy. Its great strength lay not in the array of princes and kingdoms that stood round it—but in its inner principles. It was these, and not the swords and fagot at its service, which enabled it to blind the understanding; to affright men with imaginary terrors; to make them call evil good and good evil; to subjugate the conscience, and sink society into political and moral serfdom. But the world did not understand this; and now God is about to give us a new experience of the Papacy. He has compelled it to come out of its political organization: to stand forth naked and disembodied before the world, clothed with tremendous spiritual sanctions and attributes which still enable it to awe the conscience and dominate kingdoms. Does not this show that it was the spiritual Papacy which all along was the world's oppressor?

OUTWARD DECAY: INWARD GROWTH.

This brings us to the second branch of our subject, namely, the growth and consolidation which has been going on within, contemporaneously with decadence on the exterior of the Papacy. The increase of its spiritual forces has kept pace with the decay and waste of its political appliances. The grand aim of the Papacy from the beginning was to be as God, and to rule all men with a Divine and infallible authority. It has never lost sight of this great idea, it has never parted with the hope of realizing it; and with a consistency and success of which there is no other ex-

ample in all history, it has gone steadily onward, century after century, through defeat this hour and triumph the next, to that great consummation. But the hope of reaching that dazzling eminence rested mainly on its spiritual, not on its earthly, appliances. It knew that the fashion of the world changeth; that laws, institutions, and dynasties, are mutable, that thrones may be lost by weakness or overturned by revolution; but that principles are eternal: and therefore never did it suffer check or defeat outwardly, but it cast itself anew upon its fundamental and abiding principles; it refurnished and perfected those ethereal weapons, which alone could give it such a conquest as it aimed at achieving. But for this, the Papacy would have fallen long ago; it would have disappeared with the mediæval kingdoms amid which it arose. But so far from this, while its companion monarchies are in the grave, the Papacy still flourishes; and here it is, engaged in a great muster of its spiritual forces, now complete in number and perfect in strength, preparatory to a more deadly encounter with Liberty and Christianity than it has ever yet waged.

Let me briefly describe how this has come about, and at the same time offer a forecast of what it is likely to end in. The late Pontificate—I mean of Pius IX.—was wholly passed in recasting the dogmas of the Papacy, and in giving them their fullest possible development. Conclusions to which the Papacy had all along logically pointed—but to which no one, at least in modern times, had dared to push it—were decreed as dogmas, and marshalled in hostile array against modern society. This was the life-work of Pius IX.: I

mean of the doctors and Jesuits of the Curia; for, personally, the Pope himself was not equal to so great a labor. And for what end was this work undertaken? Not merely to recover the temporal sovereignty—in other words, the Papal States—a comparatively small matter; but to put the Papacy in a position to resume that far vaster temporal supremacy which the Popes of the middle ages had exercised over the whole of Christendom.

THE "SYLLABUS" INFALLIBILITY.

In order to do this it was necessary, first of all, to set full before the world's eye, and fix deeply in the world's belief, the idea of a Divine Vicegerency—a great spiritual authority on whose shoulder God had laid the government of the world, and whom he had qualified to bear so great a burden by the superhuman qualities with which he had endowed it. Hence the two great outstanding acts of the late Pontificate: I mean the proclamation of the SYLLABUS and the Decree of INFALLIBILITY. The first, the "Syllabus," to wit, is a store-house of the laws of the Church of Rome, as they have come at last to be stamped with the impress of perfection and unchangeableness. The second, the "Infallibility," is the focus into which the whole legislation of Rome has been gathered, and whence it again radiates forth over the world in a tyranny that absorbs all rights, crushes all consciences, nullifies all laws, and dominates all kings and nations. In these two documents is presented the perfect image of that superhuman Vicegerency which, according to Papal teaching, God has set up upon the earth. Or, to put it more briefly and simply: the Syllabus is the code; the

Infallibility is the hand in which it is held and by which it is administered.

And what is the work for which this vast and careful preparation has been made? That work consists of two parts: the *first* is to combat the Revolution; the *second* is to restore the Christian State. There is a world to be pulled down; and there is a new and better world to be built up on the foundations of the Syllabus. As regards the Revolution which the Church of Rome declares it to be one grand branch of her work to combat, it is necessary to have a correct idea of what the Pope means by "Revolution."

In the Papal vocabulary words do not mean the same things which they do in ordinary speech. The term "Revolution" in the mouth of the Pope does not denote the atheistic and destructive doctrines of Communism and Socialism, which are at this hour working so mischievously in the European kingdoms. Revolution in Papal phraseology is but another name for Constitutional Government. This the Pope denounces as Naturalism: because it is government on the natural principles of reason and equity; and because it brings two execrable impieties, as the Pope holds them, in its train, toleration of opinion and liberty of conscience. The German Empire is a revolution: the French Republic is a revolution, and the kingdom of Italy, with Rome for its capital, is the greatest revolution of all.

This is the revolution which the Papacy deems it its mission to combat, holding it to be wicked and blasphemous rebellion against God and his Vicegerent on earth.

[To be Continued.]

Cardinal Newman and the Virgin Mary.

The London *Tablet*, the leading Roman Catholic paper in England, noticing the visit of Cardinal Newman, April 16, to a school conducted by priests at Oscott, says: On leaving, Cardinal Newman specially asked for the prayers of the boys. How readily they responded to the request was seen in the evening, when the entire community assembled in the college chapel and publicly said the rosary for the intentions of his Eminence.

With what a grim smile must the great John Henry Newman have read this account of his visit. When, nearly fifty years ago, he led the Tractarian movement that took so many Oxford men "over to Rome," little did he anticipate that the "rosary of the Blessed Virgin" would be the most effectual prayer that the followers of the Pope could offer up for him. As a Protestant Episcopal minister, he had Jesus only as his advocate. Now he has Mary, the mother of Jesus. Has the change brought him nearer to God? As a converted Catholic Irishman once said, to take the crown of redemption and salvation from the head of Jesus and place it on the head of Mary, does not conduce to growth in grace or make sure of the eternal life that the Son of God promises to all who believe in Him. Cardinal Newman should remember the words of the Almighty, "I am a jealous God," and the words of Jesus, "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me," "For there is none other name under heaven given among man, whereby we must be saved"—certainly not the name of Mary.

TYPICAL CATHOLIC SAINTS.

BY LEO REED.

XII.

OF all the doctrines and commandments evolved by saints and other Romish writers, none is more unscriptural, or has been more fraught with mischief, perhaps, than that of "spiritual direction," a term meaning "a summary of the counsels which a person, experienced in the ways of God and the Science of the Saints, gives to a soul which asks for them in order to advance in perfection." In plainer words, it means the complete surrender of conscience by one individual to the implicit direction of another. As a shining example, witness Queen Isabella of Spain, wise and naturally humane, led by her confessor into the worst cruelties of the Inquisition.

Reference has before been made to a small volume entitled, "Spiritual Direction." The work is of comparatively recent date, and appeared originally in the French language. It is designed for the exclusive use of convents. The author has omitted his name on the title page; an omission perhaps indicating on his part a last remaining spark of common sense, or prudence, or shame; but the responsibility for the translation is assumed, sad to relate, by a lady, presumably intelligent, named Miss Ella McMahon, a spectacle to make angels weep, as will presently appear. The work is entrenched behind the approbations of the archbishops of Avignon, of Port of Spain, of Aix; the bishops of Hebron, of Constantine and Hippone, of Evreaux, of Vannes, of Versailles; and last, though not least,

the imprimatur of His Eminence, John, Cardinal McCloskey, Archbishop of New York. This formidable array of authorities and titles should deter any one from questioning the genuineness of the teachings so endorsed; and in his preface the author moreover says: "All that we have said is gathered from the writings of Saints and Doctors of the Church, all approved by the Church, have served us as guide and furnished the most beautiful pages of our book."

On the cover of the book are printed conspicuously the words, "Come, follow me and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." Mark X: 21. The use of this, as well as of other passages throughout the work, illustrates well the ancient truth, that there is no heresy for which a pillow cannot be found in Scripture.

It is condescendingly admitted that the ordinary Catholic may stumble into his plebeian heaven in the common way; but for the spiritual aristocracy, the members of religious orders, careful guidance of every step on the steep and slippery path to perfection is indispensable. While the conductor need not of absolute necessity be a priest, yet no one else is so well qualified for the important office, and on some of "the most beautiful pages of our book" the advantages and claims of the priest are set forth in a manner that fairly takes one's breath away. On pages 80-1 the nun Herminie is quoted as follows:

"Oh! how I love, how I venerate the Priest, God's Servant, the minister of the

Divinity; the Priest raised by sacred grace above the angels; the Priest who daily holds in his hands the Saviour of the world, Jesus Christ, whom he represents on earth! The Priest, the friend of God, the friend of man, the mediator between God and man, and who unceasingly bears messages from one to the other: he is the dispenser of bread to the poor, of comfort to the sick, of consolation to the afflicted. He is ever, and at all times, the father and the providence of all. At our birth the Priest makes us children of heaven by giving us light and grace. At our death, it is again the Priest who helps us to pass the bounds of the last and terrible passage; he encourages us at this dread moment, he exhorts us, and, reclothing us a last time in the robe of innocence, opens to us the gates of eternal life. And during the short space which separates the cradle from the tomb, how frequently have we to bless the hand of the Priest ever extended to his unfortunate brothers? How often has this venerated hand poured balm on our wounds, dissipated our fears, banished our sadness? How many times has this paternal hand withdrawn us from the abyss? Yes, when the ties which bind us to heaven are broken, the Priest weeps like a father over the sorrows of a son. Sustained by his great heart, he prays, and with touching patience and perseverance labors to repair the misfortune. His gentle, firm words follow the traces of the evil and efface it, he restores what was fallen and fortifies it; he warms what was cold, and reunites between father and son the ties which were so sadly severed."

In a note on page 101 the religious is taught: "Let your attitude towards

your director be a supernatural one. The priest is Jesus Christ. Your director is in a measure Jesus Christ adapting Himself to you, to better purify, enlighten, strengthen and console you. Never forget this great truth, and know how to observe a happy medium between pusillanimity and familiarity."

Page 118: "Our director is an Angel expressly sent us by God to make known His will to us. 'And if he is a priest,' says St. Bonaventure, 'he is another Jesus Christ, for where, think you, Jesus Christ ought to be?' adds the Saint. 'In the breast of a good priest, and in the heart of a wise director.' We must approach him then with a heart disposed to receive as an oracle all that he will say in relation to our soul."

To understand the boldness of the language here used, it is but necessary to remember that the Church is addressing her religious communities, ideal Catholics, slaves, whose every faculty of mind and soul she has bound with fetters of steel. In speaking to them it is not worth while to use circumlocution; in her religious system the priest is the central figure, "the mediator between God and man," and the fact is broadly stated, which to the world at large is merely glossed over.

As the priestly director holds the place of God, it follows logically that he is infallible. But we are not left to conjecture on this point. On pages 148-9 the religious is told:

"You lack faith in the state of grace possessed by your confessor. He also has a triple grace—the grace to hear you, the grace to answer you."

"Admire here a delightful mystery. God gives the priest a supernatural hearing and in the sacrament of penance a hearing which may be called

sacramental. You wish to represent something to him one way, always, doubtless, in good faith and with an intention to act uprightly,—he, enlightened by God, understands it in a totally different manner. Is he in error? No, certainly not! He understands as God wishes him to understand. He gives you a decision which you did not expect, and this decision is from God, it is the only one you need at the time, and the more firmly you hold to it the nearer you will be to the truth. . . . God knows you; you go to the priest as to God, therefore the priest knows you. Know moreover that it is easy for a priest, had he ever so little experience in the guidance of souls, to recognize those whom God sends to him. He has grace for this."

Piety is not an essential trait in the character of this infallible guide. It is expressly so stated, however incredible the fact may appear.

Page 74: "'Our director' says St. Teresa, 'should be pious and learned; but if we cannot find these two qualities united, it is better to take one who is learned, rather than one who is pious but not learned.'"

The word pious is thus defined by Nuttall: "Reverencing the Supreme Being; godly; devout." Webster gives as synonyms, godly, devout, religious, holy, righteous. Now without reverence for God, without being religious, in short, without piety, it is impossible to be a Christian. And an irreligious teacher of religion is unavoidably a hypocrite.

"Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch." Matt. 15: 14.

But the director should be learned,

"versed in spiritual science," it is explained. An important branch of this spiritual science is that cess-pool of iniquity, a certain portion of "moral" theology, a knowledge of which is required in the confessional, where, more than any where else, spiritual direction is imparted. A small portion of this kind of "science" was once brought to my notice, a fragment of P. Dens' work, (at one time a standard text-book in Catholic seminaries,) translated into English. The owner kept the thing under lock and key, and well he might, for the diabolical foulness of a single page would dismay the oldest veteran in lewdness. Oh! yes, the guide to heaven must possess "learning," even if he is without piety.

An appendix to "Spiritual Direction" consists of two letters of Marie Lataste, in which the nun sets forth verbal communications received, so it is claimed, direct from Christ himself. Only short extracts can here be given, but let the reader brace himself.

"Yes, My daughter, you need a director that he may teach you that of which you are ignorant: the science of salvation, the science of the supernatural life. Though through kindness to you I have deigned to instruct you Myself, yet it is necessary that you submit My instructions to your director, that you may learn through him and know positively that you may receive My teachings and conform yourself thereto, for they contain nothing contrary to truth on the subject of your faith, your hope, your charity, and all the actions of your life. You fear to be the victim of illusions; who will reassure you on this point if not your director."

Here is modesty! The immediate

instructions of the Saviour are to be submitted to the priest for his approval or disapproval! But we read again in the second letter; pages 242-3: "Your director is clothed with My priesthood, that is, with the greatest dignity that can possibly be communicated to man. He is a priest, he holds My place, he acts as I Myself would act, he has all My powers. You should consequently regard Me as living in his person; you should honor Me in honoring him, respect Me in respecting him; hear My voice in listening to him; submit to Me in submitting to him; you should feel for him the deepest and most sincere gratitude; you should love him as the spiritual father of your soul, as your guide, your counsellor, and your Saviour; for he fills for you the part of Saviour which I have assigned to him, as I have to all My priests. These sentiments should also be the rule of your exterior conduct. If you act with faith and piety, you will make yourself known to your director with simplicity, telling him all that you know, hiding nothing from him, communicating your secrets and the most intimate trials, you will speak to him as to God, whom you would not deceive, because he knows all things, even the most hidden thoughts; you will speak to him as to God, that is, as to your father, with confidence and freedom, hoping everything from him, and abandoning yourself to him with the conviction that he will act in the best way possible to enlighten you, to succor you, to keep you in the combats or trials of life. You will submit your will to his as to Mine; you will not dispute with him; you will defer to his wisdom. You will be in his hands an instrument full

of intelligence, to accomplish all that he prescribes."

Of such outrageous doctrines, lies and blasphemies one of the approving archbishops could write, "The correctness of doctrine and the spirit of wisdom manifest in the editing of the book, persuade us to recommend it very particularly to the religious communities of our diocese."

The reader will have noticed in the extract from Marie Lataste's second letter, the injunction to hide nothing from her director. To understand more clearly the meaning of that injunction, let us turn once more to that other monument of blasphemy and infamy, Liguori's masterpiece, "The True Spouse of Christ." Speaking to nuns the Saint says, page 341: "What I would advise is, that all would explain to their confessors their passions, attachments, and the causes of their temptations, that he may be able to cut off the roots, which, if not extirpated, will never cease to cause temptations, and will expose the soul to great danger of consenting to sin, when she can, but will not, remove the cause. It will also be very profitable to disclose the temptations which are most humiliating, particularly thoughts against chastity, though there should be no consent."

Satan himself could not have devised a more deceptive snare. The nun is to disclose to her confessor, not only actual sins, but her *passions, attachments*, and the *cause* of her temptations. The priest is an unmarried man, the nun an unmarried woman. Very likely he is her only male acquaintance; and her conferences with him are frequent, for in the convent frequency of confession is a religious duty, and spiritual direction is only another and more extreme

form of auricular confession.

To sum up :

The priest is "the mediator between God and man : at all times the father and the providence of all."

"The priest is Jesus Christ."

He is infallible. He should be "learned" but he may be a hypocrite. Nevertheless he must be loved "as your guide, your counsellor, and your Saviour."

"You will submit your will to his as to mine."

The nun shall explain to the priest her passions, attachments, and "particularly thoughts against chastity."

Such doctrines and precepts are outrageously false and blasphemous, the outcome of insane ambition and bottomless corruption, the inspiration of the devil! They are degrading, polluting, damning!

Shame upon their authors! Shame and indelible disgrace upon a proud and corrupted priesthood which sanctions, promulgates, and enforces them.

The Church claims monasticism as the highest and best form of her religion. In reality it is the lowest and worst. Could Catholics see and examine in all its details the inner life of the cloister, thousands would turn away from their church in disgust and horror.

PITTSBURGH, May 15, 1888.

FATHER MCGLYNN'S OLD PARISHIONERS.

THE parishioners of St. Stephen's Church held a meeting at International Hall, in East Twenty-seventh street, New York, April 27. Brother McDermott spoke of Dr. McGlynn's opposition to the parochial school system and agreed with him. The busi-

ness of the priests, he said, was to look after the spiritual welfare of the people and not bother themselves with teaching arts and sciences, which could very well be left to the public educational institutions.

But Brother McDermott should know that the principal teaching the priests aim at is faith in the "holy Roman Catholic Church," and not the arts and sciences. He, like the other McGlynn parishioners, will learn this by and by.

The interesting announcement is made that Miss Agatha Munier was married to a gentleman named Atkins by Mayor Hewitt at the City Hall, New York, May 9, 1888. Miss Munier was for twelve years musical director and leader of the choir of St. Stephen's Church when Dr. McGlynn was pastor, and when he was "clubbed out" a year and a half ago, Miss Munier and the other members of the choir went with him. She has been director of the music at the various meetings held in this city by Father McGlynn. She was a "good Catholic" until Dr. McGlynn was suspended and excommunicated. Now, like thousands of other Catholics, she has so little respect for the Roman machine, and so little faith in its sacraments and ceremonies, that she will not be married in a church or by a priest, McGlynn's influence in leading the people "out of Rome" is more far-reaching than people imagine. May Almighty God through His Holy Spirit guide and direct him and them, and all other Catholics, to the Saviour Jesus Christ, the only Priest, who offered Himself as the sacrifice for their sins, and the sins of the whole world, and who ever liveth to make intercession for all those who believe in Him.

THE CHURCH OF ROME NOT THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

BY PAUL LE CLAIR.

V.

What is the respective relation of the Church of Christ and of the Church of Rome to the Holy Scriptures?

1. *The Authority of the Scriptures.* 2. *The Interpretation of Scripture.*
3. *Who may possess the Scriptures*

1. THE AUTHORITY UPON WHICH THE HOLY SCRIPTURES ARE TO BE RECEIVED.

I.

WERE a man, claiming to be an ambassador from a sovereign prince, to come to a rebellious province, bearing a proclamation of amnesty, a question of prime importance with the rebels would be: "How are we to know that this man is truly an ambassador from our King? He is a stranger to us, we therefore, cannot accept his *mere assertion* as proof. We must see his *credentials*." In the case of our Saviour, himself, and of the Apostles, *their credentials were the miracles which they wrought*. From those wonderful works of power and grace, it was abundantly evident, "they were teachers come from God, for no men could do the signs which they did, except God were with them." (John iii: 2; v: 36; x: 37, 38.) And so, by many infallible proofs, they established among men the Divine Authority of the Gospel message of "Peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ," which message we now have in the Holy Scriptures.

2. Accordingly, the Church of Christ holds "that the authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, depends not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God, the author thereof; and therefore, it is to

be received, because it is the Word of God." (2. Tim. iii: 16; 1. John v: 9. 1. Thess. ii: 13.) But while admitting that, "we may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to a high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scriptures;" (1. Tim. iii: 15;) yet, the Church of Christ holds, that "our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority of the Scriptures, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by, and with the Word in our hearts." (1 John, ii: 20, 27; John xvi: 13, 14; 1 Cor. ii: 10, 11.)

3. The Church of Rome, on the contrary, holds and teaches, that the Holy Scriptures, without the attestation of the (Roman) Church, have no more authority to bind the faith of men than have any other ancient writings; for it is only by the test, trial and examination of that Church, that the Scriptures are ascertained to be the inspired Word of God: and hence, without the attestation of the Church, the Scriptures are not known to be inspired, nor are we bound so to receive them. (*Rhem. Test. Anno. on Gal. 2: 6.*) If you should ask a Romanist for the proof that his church is invested with this vital power? he will reply by quoting a passage of Scripture! (possibly, Matt. iii: 17,) assuming, of course, that the church there mentioned, is the Papacy.

That is, the authority of the Scripture is established by the testimony of the

Church ; and then, the authority of the Church is established by the testimony of the Scripture. This mode of reasoning is what the Logicians name—“Arguing in a circle”—It is evidently fallacious and proves nothing. But were the argument valid, it would prove only, that in this respect, the Church of Rome is not the Church of Christ.

II. THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

1. Upon this point, the doctrine of the Catholic Church of Christ is:—

(1) That the infallible rule of Scripture interpretation, is the Scripture itself; when, therefore, there is a question as to the true and full sense of any Scripture, it may be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly. (John v: 39, 46; Acts xv: 13-15.) (2) That the supreme judge by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined ; and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and of private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other than the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture. (Matt. xxii: 29-32 ; Acts xxviii : 25-27 ; Eph. ii: 20.)

2. The Church of Rome, however, arrogates to herself the exclusive right to expound the Scriptures ; maintaining, that no one else has the right to search the Scriptures for himself, or to understand them in a sense different from her teaching. This monstrous claim of lordship over the Word of God and over the minds and consciences of men. Rome attempts to justify by the pretence, “that their Popes and other Bishops, are always guided in expounding the Word of God, by the same divine Spirit of infallibility, that was granted by our Lord to his holy Apostles ; and that no other persons since

the days of the Apostles, are so guided into all truth of religion.” (*Milner’s Catechism.*)

3. That this claim of infallibility in expounding the Scriptures, is a false pretence, is evident from the historic fact, that many Popes, Bishops and councils, have repeatedly contradicted and reversed the authoritative decrees of each other ; while the whole Papal society has, in so many particulars, violated the law and order of Christ’s Church as established by the Apostles, and as recorded in the Holy Scriptures, that it has forfeited all just claim to be considered a branch of the Christian Church. Certainly, they who contradict each other, do not all speak the truth : and that church or society, which stately violates the condition of Christ’s promised presence, (Matt. xxviii: 18-20,) must boast in vain the guidance of Christ’s Spirit.

4. Gregory the Great, who became Pope in the year A. D. 590, in reproofing the ambition of his rival, the aspiring Patriarch of Constantinople, said : “He who calls himself Universal Bishop, or desires to be so called, is the fore-runner of Anti-Christ.” But from the time of Pope Boniface III., the successor of Gregory, the Popes of Rome have claimed universal supremacy in the Church, as the successors of Peter, and vicars of Christ. (1.) In the year A. D. 1308, the seat of the popedom was removed from Rome to Avignon, which remained the capital of the pretended “States of the Church,” until 1378, when two Popes were elected, one at Avignon and the other at Rome. During the following period of schism and of fierce contention, which continued for about fifty years, the Church had two, and sometimes

three Popes, each claiming to be the sole, supreme, infallible successor of Peter, and each denouncing his rivals as impostors! From the year A. D. 251, there are enumerated forty Anti-Popes; that is, Popes, who on some good ground of right, claimed the infallible popedom, in opposition to a similar claim on the part of their more successful competitors.

(2.) In the year A. D. 1590, Pope Sixtus V. published a revised edition of the Latin Vulgate Bible, and by an authoritative decree, commanded that it should be universally received as the "True, legitimate, authentic, undoubted edition of the Holy Scriptures; and that all future editions should be conformed to it, without changing, adding, or omitting the least syllable, on pain of the greater excommunication." In utter contempt of the infallible Sixtus, and in disregard of his infallible decree, an infallible successor, Clement VIII., suppressed the infallible work of Sixtus, and published another infallible standard edition of the Scriptures, making in it more than two thousand corrections! (Keary's Historical Review of Papal Infallibility.)

III. THE BIBLE ALLOWED TO THE CLERGY, BUT FORBIDDEN TO THE LAITY.

1. This is another distinguishing mark of Rome. The regulation was formally adopted and promulgated in the year A. D. 1229, by the Council of Toulouse. The principle being, that none but the clergy are required to read and study the Word of God; it being sufficient for the laity, that they listen to it from their pastors. The laity, however, may be permitted to read the Scriptures, "but with due submission to the interpretation and authority of the Church." (*Milner's Catechism.*)

A regulation apparently so unreasonable and despotic, is in the Papal community, an absolute necessity; for were their people allowed the free use of the Holy Scriptures, without note and comment, they could not be held in their allegiance to the Pope.

2. In the general Church of Christ, on the contrary, a totally different doctrine and practice on this point, prevail. It is therein held, that it is the privilege of all classes of persons to possess the Scriptures, and the duty of all to search them for their own edification, according to the direction of the blessed Redeemer, the Great Prophet of his Church:—"Search the Scriptures." (John v: 39.)

3. From these words of the Saviour, it is properly inferred:—

(1) That the Scriptures then extant, (The Old Testament) were either in the possession of the persons addressed, or were easily accessible to them. (2) That the sense of those Scriptures was sufficiently perspicuous to the common intellect of men; who are nowhere in the Word of God, subjected to the pretended infallibility of uninspired men. (3) That as the persons here addressed, were evidently an assemblage of mixed character, diverse attainments, and of various classes, the duty enjoined is not confined to any special class, as the clergy or the learned; but is, without exception, the precious privilege of all sorts and conditions of men. And, (4) That each individual, might, by a personal examination of the Scriptures of the Prophets, be convinced for himself, that Jesus of Nazareth was the long promised Messiah.

4. And it further appears that the New Testament Scriptures, no less than those of the Old Testament, are to be

freely possessed and studied by the common people, as well as by the learned; not only on account of the superior light and liberty that distinguish the Gospel Dispensation; but because the Christian Scriptures declare themselves designed for the people generally. (Psalm xix: 8; cxix: 130; Prov. xxx: 5; 2. Tim. iii: 15; Isa. xxxiv: 1, 16; Eph. vi: 17; Luke 1: 3, 4; Acts 1: 1; 1. Thess. v: 21; 1. Peter, iii: 15.) And then, while it is conceded, that it is the office and duty of the clergy to instruct the people out of the Holy Scriptures; it is at the same time, the corresponding privilege and duty of the people to examine for themselves, from the same Scriptures, what they hear from their pastors, that every one may be fully persuaded in his own mind. (Acts xvii: 11.)

And thus it appears, that while the faith of the Romanist rests upon the word of his priest; the faith of the Christian rests upon the Word of God. —That in the Church of Christ, the individual believer enjoys a divine privilege, of which, in the Church of Rome, he is unjustly and cruelly deprived.

Irish Catholic Slaves.

THE Pope has condemned "Boycotting" and the "Plan of Campaign" in Ireland. His circular to the Irish Bishops is dated from the office of the holy Roman and universal Inquisition, April 20, 1888. With the fate of Father McGlynn before their eyes, no bishop or priest has publicly denounced the Pope for interfering in Irish politics against their interests, but privately they are praying backwards for him with a vengeance. The Irish members of parliament, however, into whose pock-

ets the Plan of Campaign has put the rents due the landlords, have protested vigorously against the circular. Forty of them—all Roman Catholics—met in the Mansion House, Dublin, May 17, and after a session lasting nine hours, issued a series of resolutions which began by saying "that the allegations of fact set forth in the circular are to our knowledge unfounded," and closed with the sixth resolution as follows:

While unreservedly acknowledging the spiritual jurisdiction of the Holy See, we, as guardians of those civil liberties which our Catholic forefathers resolutely defended, feel bound to solemnly reassert that the Irish Catholics can recognize no right in the Holy See to interfere with the Irish people in the management of their political affairs.

Six thousand Catholics assembled in Phoenix Park, Dublin, Sunday May 20, to protest against the Papal interference in Irish politics. The cable report says there were no priests present, but the Parliamentary protest was endorsed.

Notwithstanding their "protest," the Catholic members of Parliament will obey Rome. They will never gain Home Rule, in the sense of separation from England. While they and their countryman are Roman Catholics they are slaves, and slaves always had masters to rule them. It is in the nature of things that Protestants, with the Lord on their side in truth and righteousness, should be the masters of superstitious Romanists who fear the Pope more than they fear God, and who disregard the law of God and obey the law of the Pope. While this reasoning applies to God-fearing Protestants everywhere, we do not overlook the fact that weak-kneed Protestantism succumbs to aggressive Romanism, as in many parts of the United States.

ARE ROMAN CATHOLICS ILLITERATE?

REV. DR. MACARTHUR AND FATHER YOUNG.

IN the New York *Sun*, April 22, 1888, appeared an interesting correspondence between Rev. R. S. MacArthur, D. D., pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York, and Rev. Alfred Young, one of the Paulist Fathers attached to the Church of St. Paul, Ninth Avenue and Fifty-ninth street. The correspondence was sent to the *Sun* by Father Young, because Dr. MacArthur refused to denounce one of Father Young's brother priests who had told the truth about the illiteracy of a majority of the parishioners of St. Paul's Church.

Father Young's first letter is as follows :

I.

FATHER YOUNG TO DR. MACARTHUR.

NEW YORK, March 13, 1888.

REV. AND DEAR SIR : My attention has been called to the following paragraph in THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, [January 1888,] which reads as follows:

A SEVERE INDICTMENT.

The Rev. R. S. MacArthur, D. D., pastor of Calvary Baptist Church, New York, said in a recent letter to the "Chicago Standard," that Romanists hope to progress, by adaptation, in this country. Doctor MacArthur had a prolonged conversation with a prominent priest connected with the Paulist Fathers, who pronounced a severe indictment against his own Church, when he said that one difficulty in introducing congregational singing is, that the great majority of the people could not read the hymn if it were printed and placed under their eyes.

As the work of bringing the subject before our clergy and people, in hope of restoring congregational singing to its normal and rightful practice in our churches, has been intrusted to me by

my superiors, I am naturally anxious to know if in the above you are truthfully reported. I would also consider it a favor if you would kindly give me the name of the prominent member of our community who made such an extraordinary statement to you.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant in Christ,

ALFRED YOUNG.

II.

DR. MACARTHUR TO FATHER YOUNG.

Not having seen the magazine itself, I cannot tell if the copy you sent me be correct. Any way, the editor of the magazine could only guess that I wrote it. But the same paper will no doubt insert a correction if you have any to make. Permit me to say that I have the highest respect for all the Fathers of your community.

III.

FATHER YOUNG TO DR. MACARTHUR.

I send you the magazine in order that you may certify that I have made a true copy of the paragraph. Please send me also the date of issue of the *Chicago Standard* containing the original matter of the "severe indictment," which you cannot but see must be held by us as an impeachment of the personal veracity of one of our Fathers, or of your own; the statement concerning the illiteracy of our people being palpably untrue.

IV.

DR. MACARTHUR TO FATHER YOUNG.

The paragraph in the magazine is correct. "*Qui facit per alium, facit per se.*" I wrote it. I accept all responsibility for the same. My statement in

it is true. Others of your community have said about the same to me.

V.

FATHER YOUNG TO DR. MACARTHUR.

Your charge still lies at the door of each and every Paulist until you point out the man. Please to name him. I now bluntly say: Some one has been guilty of a greivous offense against truth. The charge lies between one of our Fathers and yourself, leaving the public at large to draw their own conclusions as to who is the slanderer.

VI.

An intimate friend of Dr. MacArthur's here interposes, in a letter to Father Young:

I kindly suggest (wholly on my own responsibility) that no good can come out of a continuance of the correspondence. There is no manner of doubt of the fact alleged. You must see that the Rev. Dr. MacArthur could not give you the name without lowering himself in your estimation.

VII.

DR. MACARTHUR TO FATHER YOUNG.

NEW YORK, April 14, 1888.

REV. AND DEAR SIR: Since my last communication to you I have inserted in the Chicago paper a brief statement modifying the one which originally appeared. I carefully examined your statement, and made the correction quite as strong as your somewhat indefinite forms of expression would warrant. The correction reads: "Some time ago it was stated, in substance, in one of these letters that one difficulty experienced by the Paulist Fathers of this city in introducing congregational singing into their churches is that many of the people could not read the hymns if they were placed before them. The authority was given when the reference

was made to the matter. Now an official of that Church, by implication, contradicts the truth of the statement."

My duty in relation to this matter now ends. You must be the judge as to what your duty is. You have for the second time at least repeated your threat. Thank God, the days of the Inquisition are over. I am perfectly willing to leave "the public at large draw their own conclusions as to who is the slanderer." Those who know me will not doubt my veracity; those familiar with facts will not doubt the intrinsic probability of the truth of the statement. I can name my authorities, and can bring witnesses to corroborate my word in regard to part of my authority. A newspaper discussion, should I care to enter into it, regarding the relation between Roman domination and public ignorance in several countries might be interesting and instructive to the general public.

Very truly yours,

R. S. MACARTHUR.

Father Young did not reply to that letter, except in the columns of the *Sun*, and then, of course, he had something to say of the "converted priest" who edits *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC*. He would be more than human, he would be a Christian, if he could stifle his mortification at the exposure of the illiteracy of his parishioners. He calls us an "animal" whom Dr. MacArthur has "warned" at his "hearth." We confess to being an animal, but the other part of his statement shows Father Young to be a disciple of the "Father of Lies." We honor Dr. MacArthur highly, and we know he has a warm place for us in his heart, and wishes us success in our work, but he has not "warned us at his hearth."

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL GIBBONS.

LETTER XX.

NEW YORK, MAY 16, 1888.

SIR :—In my my last letter I quoted from Father Muller's Catholic Catechism—or "Catechism of Christian Doctrine," as he presumptuously calls it—published this year with your sanction and approval, the doctrine of your Church that there is no salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church. "No salvation out of the Roman Catholic Church," says Father Muller, and you, Cardinal, send him, in a letter dated January 3, 1888, your "cordial blessing" on his "marked soundness of doctrine." And yet in your letter to Rev. Dr. Field, editor of the New York *Evangelist*, you hold out a hope of salvation to "Christians of all denominations." I have no doubt that you would be pleased to admit your Protestant friends to the Roman Catholic heaven, for their "courtesy and urbanity" to you personally. But the teachings of your Church stand in the way of your kind feelings and benevolent intentions,—teachings which you swore at your consecration as Bishop to uphold and defend. You were consecrated Bishop in 1868 in the Cathedral of Baltimore, of which you are now Archbishop and Cardinal, and as you knelt before the consecrating prelates, with your hand on the book of the Gospels you swore the following oath :

FORM OF A ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP'S OATH.

"I, James Gibbons, elect of the Church, will be from this hour henceforward obedient to blessed Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to the most blessed Father Pope Pius IX., and to his successors canonically chosen. I will assist them to retain and defend against any man whatever, the Roman Popedom, without prejudice to my rank. I will take care to preserve, defend and promote the rights, honors, privileges and authority of the holy Roman Church, of the Pope, and of his successors, as aforesaid. With my whole strength I will observe, and cause to be observed by others, the rules of the Holy Fathers, the decrees, ordinances, or dispositions, and mandates of the Apostolic See. When called to a Synod, I will come, unless I be prevented by a canonical impediment. I will personally visit the Apostolic See once every ten years, and render an account to our most blessed Father Pope Pius IX., and his successors as aforesaid, of my whole pastoral office, and of everything appertaining to the state of my Church, to the discipline of the clergy and people, and to the salvation of the souls entrusted to my care, and I will humbly receive in return the Apostolic mandates, and most diligently execute them. But if I be prevented by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger specially authorized for this purpose, a Priest of the diocese, or by some other secular or regular priest of tried virtue and piety, well instructed on all the above subjects.

"I will not sell nor give away, nor mortgage, enfeoff anew, nor in any way alienate the possessions belonging to my table, [that is, the revenues and especially real estate of the diocese,] without the leave of the Roman Pontiff. And

should I proceed to any alienation of them, I am willing to contract, by the very fact, the penalties specified in the Constitution published on this subject. So may God help me, and these holy gospels of God."

This form of oath I have copied from a small volume entitled, "Form of Consecration of Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, by Francis Patrick Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore." Published by John Murphy & Co., Baltimore, in 1868. Its authenticity cannot be questioned, for the author was one of your predecessors in the see of Baltimore. In this form of oath the pledge to pursue and oppose heretics, which is contained in the general formulary used in Europe, has been omitted for Bishops in the United States. But though the oath has been modified in true Jesuit style, as a tribute to American toleration, enough remains to show that you swore obedience to "the decrees, ordinances, and mandates" of the Roman Catholic Church. You are, therefore, bound to teach the doctrines of the Church in their entirety, and omit nothing that the Church commands. The *suppressio veri* or *suggestio falsi* will not avail you in the face of your solemn oath. The doctrine that you have sworn to teach is that there is no salvation outside the Roman Catholic Church. So says Father Muller, with your blessing, in his "Catechism No. 2, for parochial schools." In his "Catechism No. 3, for the advanced classes of parochial schools," he brings the subject out in a stronger light. In page 116 we read:

"Can any one be saved out of the Roman Catholic Church?

"Out of the Roman Catholic Church, no one can be saved, because Jesus Christ never gave nor will he ever give any other Church for the salvation of men. Those, therefore, who do not care to seek their salvation in the Roman Catholic Church, cannot have the least hope to be saved in a religion of their own make."

In page 118: "Which is the greatest grace God bestowed upon us after the grace of creating and redeeming us?

"After the grace of creating and redeeming us, the greatest grace bestowed upon us is that of calling us to the true faith in the Catholic Church, because without this grace, we cannot have the least hope to be saved."

I have enlarged upon this subject, Cardinal, because you and other Romanists like you in the United States would throw a veil over the eyes of Protestants, as you did in the case of Rev. Dr. Field, that you might disarm opposition, and pursue your course of aggrandisement and conquest in this Republic. I have little sympathy for Protestants who allow themselves to be deceived by you, for they slight the opportunities afforded them of learning the truth—the truth of God as contained in his Word, and the truth regarding the false teachings of your Church. They are themselves to blame, and to their own conscience they must stand or fall. But I have the greatest sympathy for the Catholic people who have been shut out from all knowledge of the truth, upon whose minds and hearts the teachings of your Church have been almost indelibly impressed, as a curse, not a blessing, from Almighty God. My observation as a priest of your Church taught me this. The people have been made blind, and cannot see. God helping me, I shall enlighten them, in as far as I am able.

Yours truly,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.